

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
JANUARY 4, 2013**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 8:30 A.M., in the Board Room, Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo
- The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Cone, Chair, and the roll was called by the Secretary.

PRESENT: Cone, Carpenter, Barrera, Guarino, Tak, Valenzuela, Shafer, Zuniga

ABSENT: Salas, Rodriguez, Connor

- Chairman's Statement
- Citizens to be heard
- Announcements

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2013-005 | 950 Donkey Barn |
| 2. Case No. 2013-007 | 1036 S. Alamo |
| 3. Case No. 2013-002 | 250 Laurel Heights |
| 4. Case No. 2013-003 | 651 S. Main St. |

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Carpenter and seconded by Commissioner Guarino to approve the cases on the Consent Agenda based staff recommendations.

AYES: Cone, Carpenter, Barrera, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Rodriguez, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

5. HDRC NO. 2012-018

Applicant: Katherine Moltz

Address: 103 9th Street

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install one (1) externally-lit monument sign advertising the Wyndham Garden Hotel. The oval, aluminum sign is supported by a decorative, perforated metal base, and measures 6' tall by 8'-6" wide for a total requested square footage of approximately 96 square feet. The sign will rest on a planter that is located approximately 6 feet above the RiverWalk.

FINDINGS:

A. The requested sign would be the only freestanding sign abutting the River. This applicant was previously given HDRC approval on April 18, 2012, for two externally-illuminated building-mounted signs advertising the Bourbon Street Restaurant which are set back from the RiverWalk. This condition is consistent with UDC section 35-618.c.5.

B. The design and orientation of signs abutting the River should respond to pedestrian traffic. Monument signs, in general, are designed to respond to vehicular traffic in suburban areas, and a more simplistic design, such as a projecting arm sign or two-post sign, would respond to the pedestrian nature of the RiverWalk pursuant to UDC section 35-681.

C. The size of signs abutting the River should respond to pedestrian traffic. The proposed monument sign is of a size and scale that is common in locations responding to vehicular traffic and is excessive in relation to pedestrians. The requested size is not consistent with UDC section 35-681.c.2.

D. Due to its location in a raised planter bed 6' above the RiverWalk, the proposed monument sign would appear approximately 12' tall as measured from the River level, and is not consistent with UDC section 35-678.e.4. Therefore, the proposed sign should be reduced in height to mitigate this condition.

E. Due to the size and nature of the development, additional square footage beyond the typical 8 square-foot provision, is appropriate for this location pursuant to UDC section 35-681.e.1. However, staff finds that the proposed 96 square feet far exceeds the recommended allowance, and that a much smaller sign would be appropriate for use on the RiverWalk.

F. The proposed sign will be externally illuminated, consistent with UDC section 35-681.c.6.

G. The proposed materials are consistent with UDC section 35-681.c.7.

January 4, 2013

2

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted. Staff recommends either a projecting arm sign or a two-post sign in the proposed planter bed whose dimensions do not exceed 2' by 3' for a total of 12 square feet, and is no taller than 4' from the top of the planter bed.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Carpenter and seconded by Commissioner Guarino to deny based on staff recommendations and findings.

AYES: Cone, Carpenter, Guarino, Tak, Valenzuela

NAYS: Barrera, Shafer, Zuniga

THE MOTION CARRIED.

6. HDRC NO. 2013-001

Applicant: Tina M. Palmer

Address: 531 Devine St.

Withdrawn per applicant.

7. HDRC NO. 2013-004

Applicant: Rosemond Properties, Inc.

Address: 342 Furr Dr.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a new retaining wall along the street edge in front of the existing house. The proposed wall would be tiered, with two levels and a 36" wide strip of landscaping between them. The wall will be poured concrete. Each section of the wall will be 12" high.

FINDINGS:

- a. Staff finds that currently there is no retaining wall at the street edge of this property and, in accordance with the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, Section 5.C, referenced above, retaining walls should not be introduced where they did not historically exist.
- b. While there are several examples of retaining walls at the street edge on this block of Furr Dr., staff finds that most of them are on the north side of the street—opposite 342 Furr—and have lawns with a more dramatic slope down at the sidewalk. The home at 342 Furr, as well as most of the homes on the south side of the block, have lawns with a more gentle slope down from the front of the buildings to the sidewalk, thus not requiring the construction of a retaining wall.
- c. Introducing a retaining wall in front of this home would significantly alter the appearance of the property from the street.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on these findings.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Carpenter and seconded by Commissioner Shafer to reset to January 16, 2013.

AYES: Cone, Carpenter, Barrera, Guarino, Tak, Valenzuela, Shafer, Zuniga

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

8. HDRC NO. 2013-006

Applicant: Billy Lambert

Address: 1003 S. Main

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Construct a two story rear addition to the existing 2,200 square foot one story home. The proposed rear addition will include a kitchen, sitting room, laundry, and bathroom with a master suite upstairs and will be 2,320 square feet. The proposed addition will have wood siding and a three-tab asphalt shingle roof.
2. Construct a screened in porch in the courtyard of the back yard. The proposed rear addition is structured around a central courtyard space, which is proposed to become a screened in porch facing the existing side yard of the property.
3. Construct a new 595 square foot carport to the rear of the existing home and install gravel for additional parking at the northwest corner of the property. The proposed carport will connect to the proposed rear addition and will be accessed through a new rolling gate from the alley behind the home.
4. Construct a side addition to the south side of the home. The proposed addition will include a bedroom and will be 165 square feet.

FINDINGS:

- a. This application was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on December 13, 2012. At that meeting, the committee found that the proposed rear addition will significantly alter the appearance of the structure from the street as well as the way in which the structure interacts with the street. The committee noted concern over the main mass of the proposed addition being located close to the street edge on the side of the property. The committee also found that the addition turns its back to the street, moving the focus of the site to the interior, which has not historically been the way the home addressed the street. The committee noted that the change in plate height between the existing one story building and the propose two story addition is abrupt and the scale of the proposed addition is overwhelming on Guenther St. to the north of the property. While the committee found that a more contemporary design for an addition to this home may not be inappropriate, it should be scaled back to allow the original structure to be the primary element on the site, possibly incorporating a more transparent connector to draw a clear distinction between the original and the new. The committee recommended that a real or digital model be presented to help understand exactly how the proposed modifications will interact with the street and relate to the original structure.
 - b. According to the OHP survey information, the home at 1003 S. main was built in 1910 and it first appears on the 1912 Sanborn map. On this map, the house seems to have been composed of a central brick structure with two spaces at the back that may have been open air or sided in another material. Today, the house maintains brick exterior on the majority of the structure with wood siding on these two spaces at the rear.
 - c. This brick and wood home was constructed in the Queen Anne style with simplified detailing and a standing seam metal roof.
 - d. In its current state, this structure has maintained a footprint very similar to its original footprint. Similarly, the building has undergone very little exterior alteration and has been well maintained. As a result, staff finds that this structure has very high historic integrity and should be respected as a good example of the Queen Anne architectural style in San Antonio.
 - e. The proposed additions would be larger in terms of square footage than the total square footage of the existing home, which conflicts with the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, Section 1.B Scale, Massing, and Form, referenced above. According to the guidelines, new additions should be subordinate to the principal façade. While the proposed additions would be on the rear and the side of the existing home, the scale of the rear addition and the fact that this lot is on a corner means that it would be highly visible from the street and would significantly alter the spatial composition of the lot.
 - f. While the roof of the proposed rear addition would be only slightly taller than the roof of the existing structure, it will have a different form and a different slope than the existing hipped roof, which is in conflict with the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, Section 1.A.iii, referenced above.
 - g. The proposed rear and side additions will cover the majority of the lot, leaving very little space for a rear or side yard, substantially altering the spatial relationships that have historically characterized the property, in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation numbers 2 and 9, referenced above.
 - h. Staff finds that using wood siding on the proposed side and rear additions is an appropriate way to distinguish the original structure from the new construction, but that the roofing material should be metal to be compatible with the style of the existing home.
 - i. The windows on the proposed additions will maintain the height and the light configuration of the original windows on the home, but will not include an arched detail above each one. Staff finds this to be an appropriate method for maintaining the overall fenestration proportions without copying the original detail.
 - j. The proposed side addition is shown as being flush with the existing structure. Staff finds that it should be offset or incorporate a reveal between the existing and the addition, in accordance with the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, Section 1.A, referenced above.
- 1 & 2. Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on these findings. Staff recommends that the layout and massing of the proposed rear addition be reconfigured so as to appear more subordinate to the existing house and not to become the dominant visual element on the site. Staff also recommends that a standing seam metal roof be used on the new addition rather than the proposed asphalt shingles.

January 4, 2013

4

3. Staff recommends approval of the proposed carport with the stipulation that the proposed parking area at the northwest corner of the site be eliminated or relocated to an area that is not at the street edge.

4. Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that the design of the proposed addition incorporate a reveal or be offset from the existing structure to indicate the distinction between the original and the new construction.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Carpenter and seconded by Commissioner Barrera to deny conceptual approval.

AYES: Cone, Carpenter, Barrera, Guarino, Tak, Valenzuela, Shafer, Zuniga

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

- Meeting Minutes 9/19/12, 10/3/12 and 10/17/12

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Carpenter to approve meeting minutes as submitted.

AYES: Cone, Carpenter, Barrera, Guarino, Tak, Valenzuela, Shafer, Zuniga

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

- Executive Session: Consultation on attorney – client matters (real estate, litigation, contracts, personnel, and security matters) as well as the above mentioned agenda items may be discussed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.
- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 A.M.

APPROVED



Tim Cone
Chair